



King County
Department of Judicial Administration

Electronic Court Records (ECR)

APPENDIX 3: Project Chronicle

presented by SMG/Columbia Consulting
(through March 1998)

Paul Sherfey
Director and Superior Court Clerk

Roger Winters
Electronic Court Records Manager

This document was developed under grant number SJI-96-06D-A-220 from the State Justice Institute. The points of view expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.



State
Justice
Institute

This document provides an overview and history of the development of the Electronic Court Records Project for King County, particularly tracking events since 1994. The SJI-supported consulting firm who provided this Chronicle also collected a compendium of Exhibits which are not included here. Those exhibits are key documents which record or evidence a particular noteworthy development or point in the project's history. The Chronicle provides some insight into how a large urban court has approached the challenge of bringing new technology to bear on the significant costs and problems associated with traditional hard copy.

Electronic Court Records (ECR) Project Chronicle

Introduction	4
Prior to 1994.....	6
Electronic Document Imaging Projects Identified But Not Funded	6
October, 1994.....	6
National Court Technology Conference	6
November, 1994	7
Electronic Filing/Imaging Task Force Was Convened	7
February, 1995	8
Court Technology Group Vision.....	8
May, 1995	9
Marketing the EDI concept	9
August, 1995	10
Legal Requirements for Electronic Filing	10
EDI Work Group Merges with RMAC.....	10
April, 1996	10
The ECR Vision becomes a Funded Project.....	10
May 1996	11
Development of Vision and Initial Planning	11
December 1996	12
ECR Convocation 1.....	12
May 1997	12
Microfilm Replacement Project	12
June, 1997	13
Project Assessment Report	13
ECR Implementation Project: Design Statement	13
June, 1997	14
The Phased Development of ECR.....	14
Imaging and Electronic Filing Projects in Courts Nationwide	14
September, 1997	14
Project Assessment Report	14
January, 1998.....	15
Ongoing "Marketing" of the ECR Project	15
March 1998	15
Developing a Master Plan	15

Electronic Court Records (ECR) Project Chronicle

Introduction

The King County Department of Judicial Administration (DJA) has an ongoing commitment to document the Electronic Court Records (ECR) Implementation Project for the benefit of other jurisdictions considering similar initiatives. This chronicle summarizes the evolution of the ECR Implementation Project. As the chronicle describes, the ECR Implementation Project as currently constituted is the culmination of several years' effort by the Department of Judicial Administration in partnership with the Judiciary of the Superior Court.

There are a number of important lessons to be drawn from DJA's experience with electronic court records. Perhaps the most important of these is the understanding that electronic court records can only be implemented with the support and cooperation of those agencies and parties who create and use court papers. Court records are public records; changes in how these records are created, processed, preserved and accessed can only be made with the cooperation of a wide range of stakeholders. DJA is to be commended for recognizing this fact from the beginning of the ECR initiative.

An important corollary of this is the need to "market" the ECR initiative to a variety of interest groups. This marketing proceeded by identifying the needs of these groups with respect to electronic court files. DJA also identified the concerns these groups and individuals held about electronic court records. The needs and concerns of these stakeholders helped DJA shape the business and technology strategy underlying the ECR Implementation Project.

Ongoing consultation with interested parties and groups continues to be an important means of building a body of supporters for the project. This support will be important if funding for implementing the ECR system is to be obtained. More importantly, a broad base of acceptance and support is necessary if the ECR system is to be successful in supplanting paper files.

The ECR Implementation Project has probably proceeded less quickly than originally hoped. However, the additional time provided an opportunity to clarify the underlying business and technology strategy. This includes:

- Building external support for the initiative.
- Defining legislative and court rules changes required for electronic court records.
- Clarifying various policy issues.
- Evaluating various technologies.

In retrospect, DJA acted wisely in not pressing for an early implementation of the ECR system and allowing the project to proceed in a measured fashion. In particular, DJA is now in the position to take advantage of rapid advance in relevant technologies over the last several years.

While significant progress has been made, the ECR Implementation Project remains a complex and difficult undertaking. In addition to the difficulty selecting and implementing appropriate technologies and systems, there is a variety of other risky dimensions to the project. These include:

- Revising legislation to permit electronic court records to replace paper court records with electronic records.
- Modifying State and Local court rules to allow for electronic court records.
- Addressing a wide range of policy issues such as records retention, privacy, payment for electronic services and so forth.
- Work process redesign within the Clerk's office and with other agencies and parties within the justice system.
- Coordinating ECR implementation with other information systems changes in the judicial branch, other King County agencies, and the State.

A multidisciplinary approach is vital to the success of this type of initiative. DJA has recognized the need throughout the project.

As of this writing, the ECR Implementation Project is at an important juncture. During 1998, the project will move from planning to implementation. This phase is necessarily more structured than the preceding phases of the project. Project management practices will need to be structured and disciplined in order to ensure that system is implemented on time and budget. DJA must also resist “scope creep” in the planned implementation of the system.

There are technology-related risks associated with electronic court records. DJA has several strategies to minimize these risks. Perhaps the most important of these was the decision not to press for an early implementation of ECR and allow standards to emerge in the technology market and, more particularly, in the court records field.

DJA has several other strategies to minimize technology risks, which include the following:

- Selecting commonly used file formats (e.g., ASCII text, Word files) for electronic document formats acceptable by DJA.
- Evaluating various technologies in pilot tests.
- Minimizing technology migration problems by using computer-output-to-microfilm as the medium for permanent records retention.
- Obtaining expert advice about technology standards from County technology experts and external consultants.
- Participating actively in a broad range of standards-related committees.

While the particular techniques used to manage technology-related risks may differ, any court considering a similar initiative should have this as a central concern.

Funding multi-year projects such as the ECR Implementation Project is difficult issue in the public sector. In particular, funding may not be available to fund planned activities in subsequent years of the project. DJA has prudently decided to phase the implementation of the ECR system in a series of modules. Each module is intended to build on previous modules and provide financial or other benefits even if funding is not forthcoming in later years.

A final lesson to be drawn from the experience of DJA with the ECR initiative is the importance of leadership. The ECR Implementation Project has had the benefit of the personal commitment of the previous Presiding Judge, Judge Ramerman, and the Director of DJA, Jan Michels. Their leadership has created the environment within which the ECR Implementation Project can be successful. Other jurisdictions should only consider similar initiatives if similar leadership is demonstrated.

The following sections of the chronicle describe the progress of the project from its inception to March of 1998.

Prior to 1994

Electronic Document Imaging Projects Identified But Not Funded

In 1992, the Department of Judicial Administration (DJA) began to research the possibility of utilizing electronic records in the courts. Research conducted by Roger Winters, DJA Records and Research Manager, indicated that electronic records could produce significant improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the processing and management of Superior Court records. While the benefits could be

significant, DJA also recognized that the reality of implementation would be complex and require a significant cultural change in the court organization. It was clear that implementing electronic document systems in the court should be tested in a pilot program of manageable size prior to full implementation in the Superior Court.

Initially, DJA saw the opening of the Regional Justice Center (RJC) in 1997 as an ideal opportunity for introducing document imaging to the courts. As the RJC was being designed, the planning committee determined that the RJC would open with hard-copy based systems. Acquiring imaging technology was not included in the funding for the RJC. However, throughout the RJC planning process, DJA document imaging supporters kept abreast of the planning process to ensure that no barriers to document imaging were inadvertently build into the RJC plan. In particular, care was taken to ensure the new building could support the wiring needs of an electronic document management system.

In 1993, DJA identified the Juvenile Court as a possible imaging pilot program site. The Juvenile system essentially replicated all the functions of the Superior Court at a remote location and on smaller scale. In June 1993, the Department of Judicial Administration submitted a 1994 budget proposal requesting funds to develop an imaging pilot project for Juvenile Court in 1994. The County Council rejected the proposal due to lack of clear and immediate paybacks. DJA planned to resubmit the request for the 1995 budget year.

In addition, during 1993 DJA recognized that a significant outreach effort must be launched to gain support from stakeholders. Ongoing communication was established with stakeholders that could affect the acceptance and funding of an imaging project. DJA focused on outreach to the King County Budget Office, the Office of the Administrator of the Courts, the RJC Planning Committees, County Clerks, Bar Association, judges, the Prosecutors Office, users such as title companies and the public.

The failure to obtain funding for the Juvenile Imaging Pilot demonstrated the need, at an early stage of the project, to develop the support of stakeholder groups. Large system projects, such as ECR, that are expensive and require significant cultural changes require a significant marketing effort to gain funding and acceptance by affected organization and interest groups.

October, 1994

National Court Technology Conference

The Honorable Dale Ramerman, King County Superior Court, Janice Michels, Director of Judicial Administration and Superior Court Clerk, and Michael Planet, Superior Court Administrator made up the delegation from the King County Superior Court that attended the National Court Technology Conference in October, 1994. Twenty other representatives also attended the Conference from Washington State.

Judge Dale Ramerman summarized the major issues discussed at the conference in a memo to Presiding Judge Anne L. Ellington. In his memo, Judge Ramerman reviewed presentations on electronic filing and imaging in detail. The memo reviewed the benefits that electronic would provide to various stakeholders, including:

Clerk's Office - Would not have to maintain paper files. Data entry would be vastly reduced, and the labor and costs involved in creating, storing, delivering files would be eliminated. Files could not be lost or misplaced. Documents would not have to be identified and copied for appeals.

The Public - Remote access to court files at locations as diverse as libraries and copy centers. Files would be accessible simultaneously to more than one user. Hard copies could be printed out if they are wanted.

Lawyers - Serve and file papers at minimal expense. They could also access court files from their offices. Service on other counsel could be done instantaneously.

The Court - Court files could be accessed by multiple users simultaneously both in the courthouse and from remote locations. This would eliminate any problems of having court files or documents at the wrong courthouse (Kent or Seattle). Court papers would also be available within a day of filing. Hypertext features would also allow linking briefs to other cases, statutes or regulations, allowing the reader to view related documents on screen with the click of a mouse.

In the memo, Judge Ramerman also stressed that electronic filing is not some “far fetched” technology, but one that has been proven by a variety of courts across the nation. While implementing electronic filing would require significant effort in reengineering the way the court does business, the benefits would be well worth the effort. Judge Ramerman suggested that developing statewide standards would be a logical first step to implementation.

While DJA has been conducting research and reporting on the virtues of electronic court records for at least two years, the ECR effort gained significant momentum when key management at King County Superior Court could actually observe electronic records demonstrations at the National Court Technology Conference. Actually seeing demonstrations and hearing success stories from Courts that have already implemented electronic court records technology was key in generating enough excitement to spur the King County Superior Court into real action towards implementing ECR.

November, 1994

Electronic Filing/Imaging Task Force Was Convened

The National Court Technology Conference provided the spark necessary to motivate a group of representatives from the Superior Courts of Washington State that attended the conference to create an ongoing forum for the discussion of the use of electronic documents in the court system. Initially, the forum included the following participants.

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| • Brian Backus | OAC |
| • Bob Carlberg | Snohomish County |
| • Delilah George | Snohomish County |
| • N. F. Jackson | Whatcom County |
| • Sally King | Chelan County District Court |
| • Jill Koepf | Cascade District Court |
| • Jan Michels | King County Department of Judicial Administration |
| • Dale Miller | Bogle & Gates |
| • Judge Dale Ramerman | King County Superior Court |
| • Val Stone | Snohomish County |
| • Robin Trembreath | Snohomish County |
| • Siri Woods | Chelan County |
| • Judge Thomas Wynne | Snohomish County |
| • Roger Winters | King County Department of Judicial Administration |

To ensure the members of the forum had the benefit of other jurisdictions' experience with imaging technology, Mr. Winters attended an Institute for Court Management course entitled, "Document Imaging: Applications for the Courts" in December 1995. The initial meeting of this group on January 7, 1995 was primarily devoted to defining the group's purpose and priorities. The group reached consensus that they were present to discuss the problem, "How can we best facilitate Justice?" A brainstorming and prioritization process was used to develop the following list of constraints and facilitating factors this group faces in their quest to facilitate justice.

Constraints

Tradition

Facilitating Factors

Compelling Need

Finances
 Fear of and Resistance to Change
 Intimidation of Technology
 Complexity

Cooperative Spirit
 Technology's Potential
 Leadership/Vision
 Energy/Enthusiasm

Top rated targets or descriptions of the vision that the group hopes to achieve included:

- Better triage
- Finality, certainty, predictability
- Eliminate delay in delivering Justice

February, 1995

Court Technology Group Vision

This group of interested parties became known as the Court Technology (EDI) Group and over the ensuing months met regularly to develop a mission and vision for their work. On February 6, 1995, the group reached consensus on the following statements:

Reengineer Washington's Courts

Rethink, redesign, reengineer our judicial system.

Reconstruct how courts do their work to deliver better service to customers (litigants and public):

- undertake a zero-based reexamination of court functions,
- reconsider jurisdictional levels,
- remove organizational and hierarchical barriers,
- expedite cases to their earliest feasible completion, with issue identification at entry,
- expedite cases to their earliest feasible completion, with issue identification at entry,
- enable simultaneous processes that avoid delay,
- expedite and manage appeals and revisions, and
- ensure enforcement of judgments, to
- give finality, certainty, and predictability to the judicial process.

Build tomorrow's information infrastructure now

Build a statewide data web, enabling electronic data and document interchange, to make needed information readily accessible to support judicial decision-making and enforcement.

A modernized information infrastructure is necessary to gain maximum benefit from reengineering. Even before reengineering is done, essential features of this infrastructure are discernible:

- a seamless, statewide data web in which all courts and associated agencies share information and data entry,
- electronic data/document interchange, imaging, and multi-media supplanting hard copy as the principal medium for active records,
- judicial information accessible to the court and associated agencies when needed (eliminating organizational and geographic barriers),
- timely access to judicial records available for litigants, the bar and the public, both in the courthouse and remotely, and
- protection of personal privacy and confidential/sealed information ensured.

The EDI group continued to refine the vision of what technology could be effectively used by the court and what types of capabilities could be gained.

May, 1995

Marketing the EDI concept

From the very beginning, the EDI Group understood the need to gain support for the EDI concepts from a wide range of constituents. By May of 1995 the EDI group began actively seeking a “Champion” to bring EDI ideas to the Washington State Justice Information System project as well as spread the word among peer justice agencies in the state. The group was working diligently to develop a “sales piece” the group referred to as their “Sizzling Demo.” Additionally, plans were made to provide Justice Talmadge, the new chair of JIS, with an update of the work of the EDI Group. Members were also actively pursuing relationships with other related groups such as the Records Management Advisory Committee (RMAC) and personally encouraged peers to attend EDI sessions at the upcoming Spring Judicial Conference.

Over the course of the next year, the EDI group sought to market EDI concepts the following constituents:

- Court Management Council (CMC)
- Judicial Information System Committee (JISC)
- Records Management Advisory Committee (RMAC)
- Office of the Administrator for the Courts (OAC)
- National State Justice Institute (SJI)
- National Center for State Courts (NCSC)
- Judicial Electronic Document & Data Interchange (JEDDI)
- State of Washington State Archivist
- Local Records Committee
- Advisory Committee on Electronic Records
- Subcommittee on Standards
- Washington Association of County Clerks
- King County Information Resource Council (IRC)
- Law, Safety and Justice Business Area Committee (LSJBAC)
- Superior Court Dept. of Judicial Administration
- Electronic Document Management Advisory Committee (EDMAC)
- ECR Steering Committee
- Washington State Bar Association
- King County Bar Association
- Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA)
- Association for Information and Image Management (AIIM)
- Legal Waste Reduction Network
- Association of Local Agency Records Managers (ALARM)

While there was significant talk about a “sizzling demo”, it was never developed. Though it would have possibly been helpful to have a demonstration that could communicate the “look and feel” of electronic records, less “sizzling” marketing efforts did pay off over the next year to result in the form of ECR project funding in 1996.

August, 1995

Legal Requirements for Electronic Filing

In addition to marketing the concept, there were legal issues associated with the use of electronic legal documents. In August, 1995 Kristin Bjorkman submitted a memo to Roger Winters and the EDI Work Group summarizing her findings regarding the Washington Court Rules and the Revised Code of Washington which would require amendments to accommodate electronic filing of pleadings and other papers. Her research identified a series of rules that refer to the filing of “papers” that would require modification.

EDI Work Group Merges with RMAC

The EDI Work Group proposed that the Records Management Advisory Committee (RMAC) be integrated and that RMAC expanded their charge to advise the Court Management Council with also advising the State Justice Information System (JIS) regarding court records with particular emphasis on EDI. The proposal was unanimously accepted. The consolidated RMAC's first work product was to submit a request for support from JIS to fund the “dazzling demo” which the EDI Work Group had been planning since early 1994.

Minutes from the RMAC group reveal that the “sizzling demo” was discussed at length but the actual product was never produced. RMAC felt they could demonstrate the look and feel of “paperless” court operations with some type of automated presentation. While a demonstration of the technology would be desirable, RMAC's marketing was limited to verbalizing the benefits of electronic filing and imaging.

April, 1996

The ECR Vision becomes a Funded Project

In the summer of 1996, the vision developed into a funded project to develop preliminary technology requirements and a process for managing and evaluating the Electronic Court Records (ECR Project). Two grants from the State Justice Institute provided the funding for outside expertise to launch what has become known as Phase II of the ECR project where standards were developed and infrastructure planning began.

The mission of the ECR Project was defined as:

The Electronic Court Records project replaces hard copy with electronic documents to make access to court case records quicker and easier, to allow more than one person to access a document simultaneously, and to lay the foundation for business process re-engineering enabled by new information technology.

By June, project oversight had been organized with an advisory board of elected and appointed officials who were to provide general direction to the project from the judiciary, the bar and other constituents. The ECR Steering Committee was also assembled to provide day-to-day direction to the project. Representatives from the following entities were asked to participate on the Steering Committee:

- King County District Courts
- Associated Counsel for the Accused
- King County Information and Telecommunications Services
- King County Recorder's Office
- King County Law Library
- Members of the Legal Community

ECR Project Chronicle

- Office of Public Defense
- Office of the Prosecuting Attorney
- Court of Appeals
- King County Superior Court
- King County Department of Judicial Administration

Over the course of the year, the Steering Committee addressed several issues relevant to the ECR project. Research topics included:

- Technical Issues of ECR
- Procedural Issues of ECR
- Privacy and Access to Information
- Cultural Change from ECR
- Legal/Court Rules
- Judicial needs (e.g. court notes)

About the same time that all of the project management structure was being developed, the Department of Judicial Administration also convened a Work Flow Quality Team. The intent of this employee team was to document current paperflows and make recommendations for improvements to workflow before automation via the ECR project.

May 1996

Development of Vision and Initial Planning

During May through July 1996, DJA continued to develop and refine its vision for ECR. An essential input to this was the insight of DJA management and staff. Mr. Winters gave several presentations to DJA staff during this period to elicit critical comment. This process had the added advantage of preparing the organization for change.

In July 1996, DJA developed a project proposal for acquiring the services of a Technical Consultant for several reasons, including:

- Revising the ECR design;
- Educating project leadership regarding ECR implementation activities and timeframes;
- Assisting in the development of Requests for Proposal; and
- Assisting with pilot projects to test system features and capabilities.

This project proposal include a tentative "Phase 2 Schedule" indicating that DJA anticipated it could recruit a Technical Consultant, develop requirements and specifications, and procure and install a pilot ECR system in about six months. These assumptions were very unrealistic and were not, in fact, subsequently achieved.

At this point in the project, DJA did not yet have expert advice on electronic document management technology and systems development. Consequently, the plans developed for the ECR project did not reflect a complete understanding of the effort and time required to implement this type of application.

Technical expertise is required to estimate costs and develop achievable work plans for electronic document management projects. Organizations considering implementing this type of technology need the services of individuals familiar with E.D.M. technology, technology procurement, and systems implementation.

December 1996

ECR Convocation

Through the remainder of 1996, DJA continued to develop the vision for ECR in consultation with various stakeholder groups. In December 1996, DJA invited all of the stakeholders to attend the "ECR Convocation". This provided an opportunity to consolidate feedback from a number of individuals and interest groups regarding the ECR project.

The Convocation confirmed that there was broadly based support for the concepts underlying ECR. It also had the effect of raising expectations within the stakeholder community for an early implementation of the system. Furthermore, DJA did not have any plan for subsequent communications with participants.

While it is important to obtain the input of stakeholders to confirm assumptions about their requirements and to assess potential opposition, it is important to "manage" the resulting expectations. This includes the timing of implementation, the capabilities of the system, and the extent of ongoing involvement of the participants.

May 1997

Microfilm Replacement Project

DJA has historically archived completed cases in microfilm format. Due to funding cuts, the Department was forced to eliminate, at least temporarily, archiving these cases. Given limited storage space and the very high volume of new filings, the inability to archive old case files presented a significant operational problem for DJA, especially if funding was not restored.

DJA was able to turn this problem into an opportunity for the ECR Project. The Department was able to obtain funding for a "microfilm replacement project". This project, which is part of the broader ECR project, allowed DJA to acquire electronic document management technology for the purpose of scanning archival case files. Limited funding was needed because DJA was able to make use of available computing capacity within the County and to rent E.D.M. software.

The microfilm replacement project provided several benefits to the ECR project, including:

- DJA managers and staff became familiar with E.D.M. software and peripherals.
- DJA developed an improved understanding of the procedures required to scan and index large volumes of documents in an accurate and complete manner.
- The reliability, throughput, and capacity of the local and wide area were tested.
- DJA was able to evaluate options for scanning densities for online viewing and hardcopy reproduction.
- Internal and external stakeholders were able to get "hands on" experience with E.D.M. technology.

DJA has also has or plans to use this interim platform to conduct various "proof-of-concept" tests and clarify functional requirements of the full ECR system. One instance of this is the "Criminal Case Demonstration Project" to be conducted during 1998.

Using E.D.M. technology in a "proof-of-concept" mode allows organizations to improve their understanding of its potential and its limitations. It also provides an opportunity to identify and resolve policy issues and define functional requirements. Creativity may be needed to obtain funding for the technology to undertake proof-of-concept testing.

June, 1997

Project Assessment Report

ECR Implementation Project: Design Statement

In June 1997, the first draft of the ECR Design Statement was developed by the project evaluation and oversight firm, SMG/Columbia Consulting Group. The draft of the design statement outlined the potential benefits ECR could provide and a high level review of the basic processes that would be accomplished by the system from document filing to archival. The objective of the ECR Implementation Project was defined as:

"To replace the paper court file with an electronic court record by the year 2000."

The design report suggested that the "vision" of ECR would involve major "reengineering" of the operating procedures of the overall Superior Court system, which is outside of the authority of DJA. The design statement suggested that the scope be limited to redesigning processes within DJA that include maintaining and providing access to the court file, and the processes used to file documents and to access the court file. The design statement acknowledged that there are many other opportunities for additional automation, process redesign, and procedural reform that are beyond the scope defined for the initial ECR project.

While SMG/Columbia suggested that all the capabilities desired could be attainable over time, the initial implementation project should be limited to enhance the potential for success. Discussion of project scope and priorities continued for several months while Steering Committee members and other stakeholders began to adjust their own individual "vision" of the scope of ECR to the realities of a workable project plan.

With greater clarity about the scope of the ECR system, DJA was able to begin to address core policy issues. For example, a sub-committee of the Steering Committee began to define standards for what documents would be stored in the case file, how they would be named, and how they would be indexed (i.e., the "what's the record" committee). While these standards could have been developed before, automation forced the need for their resolution.

Defining a common vision and limiting the scope of the ECR project to a "doable" scale was a very difficult effort for the Court. Up until now, the ECR vision encompassed the needs and priorities of all the individuals involved. When planning actual implementation, priorities needed to be set, meaning that all stakeholders would not immediately receive all the capabilities and related benefit of ECR immediately. It was key to break the ECR project down into smaller chunks to demonstrate success and support additional funding requests.

Once a reduced scope was defined, it became clear that project management would need to manage stakeholder expectations. ECR management must be careful not to "over-sell" the potential benefits of ECR.

June, 1997

The Phased Development of ECR

To illustrate the phased implementation of ECR, Roger Winters, DJA ECR Program Manager developed a very descriptive graphic that outlined the work plan for ECR implementation to the year 2000. Additionally, Mr. Winters developed a one-page overview of the ECR project which outlined hard copy file issues, the ECR solution and project progress and activities. Both of these documents were updated

periodically and used to provide a brief and comprehensive overview of the ECR project to a variety of audiences over the coming months.

The development of these “marketing tools” was significant in that they were among the first produced that reflected the actual scope and phasing of the ECR project. Most presentations up until this point focused on educating the audience on potential benefits of ECR and not when and how those benefits could be attained. Up until this point, the ECR system was a “vision” and those involved in the project understood that the specifics of that “vision” might be different among the various stakeholders who would be affected by electronic court records. Mr. Winters graphic became an effective tool for explaining the realities of the phasing in of ECR benefits and services over time. Beginning in June of 1997, “managing customer expectations” became a common topic of discussion in planning and Steering Committee meetings.

Imaging and Electronic Filing Projects in Courts Nationwide

Cary Information Consulting (CIC) had been engaged by the Department of Judicial Administration to provide technical assistance in the planning for ECR. As part of that contract, CIC conducted a survey of similar imaging and electronic filing projects that have been undertaken by courts nationwide. The purpose was to build upon the knowledge and experience of other courts to adopt “best practices” and learn from the problems encountered.

The major finding of this study was to validate the overall vision and strategies developed by DJA. The report strongly recommended a phased implementation approach beginning with imaging and adding higher levels of complexity in stages. The report also recommended that King County not enter a public-private partnership to implement ECR despite the attraction of shared costs and start-up support. Nationwide there are more examples of failed public private partnerships than successes.

The technology directions that emerged from this research were incorporated into the technology standards for the ECR systems. DJA sought opportunities to review the proposed standards with information technology experts within the County.

Many courts have or are undertaking projects to improve case document management. There are a variety of approaches and technologies being used. Research, given rapid changes in E.D.M. technology, will improve the probability of success.

September, 1997

Project Assessment Report

The September 1997 Project Oversight Report summarized progress made in the past three months. Major accomplishment included:

- Further refinements to the “Design Statement” into a more specific project scope that has been reviewed by major stakeholders within the Superior Court system.
- Preliminary technical standards for electronic document management (EDM) technology have been developed.
- Preliminary cost estimates for the acquisition and implementation of the ECR system have been developed.
- Preliminary project milestones have been defined for the remainder of 1997 and 1998.
- An interim EDM hardware and software solution has been selected. The interim solution will project a platform for microfilm replacement imaging and “proof of concept” testing.

- DJA has begun preparing court files for scanning as part of the microfilm replacement project.

One of the most significant changes to the project plan was to reduce the overall proposed scope of the ECR project. Initially, the vision for ECR included major reengineering of processes that involved the overall Superior Court system - which is beyond the authority of DJA and is impractical as the scope of a single project. The revised scope focuses effort on matters under the control of DJA. At least initially ECR will focus on records management procedures including document filing, court file maintenance and public access to court files. Where specific support of other court system agencies and parties can be obtained, ECR technology should be used to provide remote document filing and access services. The year 2000 has been selected as the target date for implementing the full ECR system.

January, 1998

Ongoing "Marketing" of the ECR Project

Roger Winters, ECR Project Manager continues to promote ECR in various law, safety and justice and records management organizations. While the presentation does talk about the potential benefits of ECR, it also describes the phased approach to implementing ECR at the King County Superior Court and the implementation schedule. The phases include:

1. Document Management in DJA (the core of ECR)
2. Court Support
3. Law, Safety and Justice Agencies Interface
4. Electronic Filing (Public)
5. Document Access and Distribution (Public)
6. State Initiatives (Appeals, etc.)

All stakeholder communications must clearly define the implementation schedule to effectively manage expectations.

Communications with stakeholders and interest groups must be an ongoing activity to ensure continued support for a long-term project of this scope.

March 1998

Developing a Master Plan

The ECR system will be phased in over several years. This allows DJA to manage both the systems and operations impacts of ECR. A detailed plan has been developed for implementing the initial "core ECR" component of the full system. This left two important areas where additional planning was required:

1. Preparing the department for the impact of the core ECR system on the internal operations of DJA.
2. Clarifying the long-range master plan for implementing the full ECR system.

In March 1998, a retreat for DJA managers addressed these issues. A number of project objectives for 1998, 1999, and 2000 were defined. The retreat highlighted the need to build a

realistic master plan that the department could implement if these objectives were to be achieved.

An important realization at this time was the need to broaden the involvement of DJA managers in the project. An internal committee of DJA managers was created to support the implementation of the core ECR system during 1998.

Multi-year projects require both detailed, tactical plans (e.g., current year) and long-term master plans. These plans must be based on a pragmatic analysis of the ability of the organization to implement the system.